



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and chemistry, being useful in their application to the arts, with which manufactures and agriculture are so intimately connected. This species of knowledge is not only good in its direct application, but also in its beneficial, indirect influence on the minds of those who can draw amusement and instruction from the increase of useful knowledge. The well instructed young man will not only be more useful, and more secure from harm, but will enjoy a sense of innocent pleasure, of which the ignorant know not how to appreciate the advantages. Instead of roving from home, idly to look for tumultuous pleasures, he will be fond of the domestic circle, and those calm delights which are best enjoyed in the sequestered vale of life, and of which a taste for literary pursuits heightens the enjoyment.

K.

For the Belfast Monthly Magazine.

DIALOGUE BETWEEN NED AND PAT.

PAT. Good morrow, Ned; where now?

Ned. I am going to the book-sellers to buy the Magazine, that I may know the names of the rascals who signed the Popish Petition.

Pat. I have seen that publication, and viewed a list of the names affixed to the Protestant Petition, in favour of Catholic Emancipation, and think they are the most respectable I know.

Ned. All disaffected men.

Pat. Their wishing well to their neighbours is no proof of that; we are enjoined to "love our neighbours as ourselves."

Ned. Yes, that is a good old saying, and might have done well enough long ago, among the Apostles, where there were no Papists, but now they

are so numerous, that to give them power would be dangerous; it is best to keep them down. They make good soles, but bad-uppers!!

Pat. I thought the author of all good did not create his creatures with a view that one part should oppress the other. Would not this be charging the Deity with partiality and injustice?

Ned. But they have been murderers from the beginning, and my good neighbour G— who is an orangeman, and reads his bible, says that murderers should not live.

Pat. You were wrong informed, "Vengeance is mine, and I'll repay it, saith the Lord."

Ned. Then I see you on the turn to become Papist too.

Pat. No, but the way is wide enough for us all; hearts may agree, though heads differ

Ned. It is in vain to warn you of your danger. I say again, none but designing villains would put their names to that paper.

Pat. I pity your narrow minded prejudices; were you admitted to the presence of the liberal, enlightened advocates for Catholic Emancipation, who are to be found in every sphere of life from the Duke of Sussex to the peasant, you would shrink as it were, into nothing. Are we not all the children of Adam; and of course brethren, and if we "love not our brother whom we see every day, how can we love him whom we have not seen." *If we do not*, it is an evidence that the love of the father is not in us."

M.

Ballymena.

(To be Continued.)

For the Belfast Monthly Magazine.

The following reply was distributed by the author to some of his literary friends, and a copy having been

452 *A Reply to a Criticism of the Quarterly Reviewers* [June.

transmitted to us, we insert it in our pages.

A REPLY TO A CRITICISM OF THE
QUARTERLY REVIEWERS, ON EN-
SOR'S NATIONAL EDUCATION.

AS I have been resident for some months in a remote part of the kingdom, I had no opportunity of seeing the *Quarterly Review*, dated December, 1811, but published in the present year, till a few days ago. Nor should I have seen it then, had not a friend sent it to me. I do not think, that the style of this critique, is likely to give a currency to the design of the writer or writers. Yet I have been prevailed on to answer it. Were the censor unnoticed, he might rejoice beyond measure,

"But lest his heart exalt him in the harm
Already done,"

and lest to pride he should add impenitence, like the great criminal to whom Milton alludes, I write these few remarks to defend myself, and to correct him.

That an author may err, that a printer may err also, professional critics might have learned by their own mischances. And it is supposable, that critics, who extol christianity, though not more than its doctrines deserve, and who pride themselves on being its guardians, and, of course, of exemplifying its beneficial effects by their own conduct, would extend some charity to erring man—to an author, and as they say, *insane* withal. Yet their conduct has been the reverse, and offers one of those contradictions for which good men have endeavoured to account by original sin, which they say, frequently defeats the most religious education, and the best opportunities.

That the *Quarterly Reviewers* can

err in judgment, I beg leave to refer to their criticism on Mr. Leckie's *State of Sicily*. For his exposition, they called him a *system-monger*, and all their observations are uttered with the same temper; while they praise the Sicilian parliament, the Sicilian nobles, and affirm, that "the Sicilians are distinguished by that sincere attachment to their Sovereign, which his mild and paternal government has so well deserved." Could they say more of George the Third? I refer to this article, though the political notions of the *Quarterly Reviewers* are consistent on all occasions, because this descant on a paternal and patriotic Sovereign and government has been refuted beyond controversy by the measures, at last, adopted by the commander of the British forces in that country.

After this error in judgment, I beg leave to mention a critical oversight of this acute body. After quoting, (*Quarterly Review*, May, 1811, p. 519,) from the Editor of Madame du Deffand's Letters, "at the commencement of Mr. Walpole's acquaintance with Madame du Deffand, he was near fifty, and she was above seventy years of age, and *entirely blind*;" they in the next page with great composure state, "when she saw Mr. Walpole, she thought she had found the object of her search." Voltaire called Madame du Deffand *l'aveugle clairvoyante*. This title the *Quarterly Reviewers* have henceforward acquired to themselves.

The charges brought against me are various. They accuse me of having *read much*. With this offence I admit they have always stood unimpeached. They also state, "never, perhaps, were the books of all ages and languages rifled for a meaner purpose." The labour of collection must have been considerable,

unless aided by some mechanical process." Why did not the Quarterly Reviewers require their artist in ordinary to delineate for the benefit of their readers this hypothetical machine, which could abridge the labour of learning many languages, and of reading and noting the authors who composed in them.

I pass over their desultory charges of being "a disciple of Paine and Godwin," and the language they apply to me as "querulous snarlings of an irritable and disappointed misanthrope," "his ravings" "when the imagination is evidently disordered." Yet I cannot refrain from asking them, Do they not by such discourse convict themselves while they condemn me?

These gentlemen quote four passages from *National Education*, but which they denominate "a farrago of pedantry and folly," in order to show that I may, in referring to Greek authors, commit some inaccuracies of translation. They say, "Early in this work the following passage is quoted from Isocrates, *χαλεποι εστι περι την αυτην υποθεσιν δυω λεγους ανεκτως ποιειν*." The penultimate word, he says, for obvious reasons, I have omitted to translate. What his obvious reasons are, we are at a loss to guess—but this we know, that it is essential to the sense of the passage. It means, 'without being tiresome'." If these critics will refer to Hedericus, they will find *ανεκτως* translated *tolerabiliter*, *commode*. From the known egotism of Isocrates, I adopted the latter interpretation, and I did think that it was obvious I should not say of myself, "that it is difficult to speak *commode* twice on the same subject."

Another charge of inaccuracy they state, beginning "Thus too, Diogenes," &c. This error of the Reviewers I can only account for, by

BELFAST MAG. NO. XLVII.

supposing, that as they saw *ευλογον*, and eulogy, they fancied by their *coup d'œil*, which has more than once deceived them, that I translated *ευλογον* by eulogy. If the Reviewers will look again at the passage, they will perhaps see that the words in the text "are connected in the same eulogy," are my application of the passage referred to in the Greek, which is translated by those words, which immediately precede them. As to my translation of the two remaining passages, which they have noted, I have used no more liberty than every person may fairly employ, not more, perhaps, than a translator of an entire work is privileged in using, who does not experience the difficulty of applying a single passage to a particular situation.

The Quarterly Reviewers say of Mr. Ensor, "Nor do we recollect any living individual who is introduced for the sake of approbation; except it be once or twice Lord Erskine," &c. I am sorry their recollection is so bad, or so convenient. I have praised Miss Edgeworth, Sir Samuel Romilly, Mr. Lancaster, and others; but I have not praised Dr. Bell, nor Mrs. Trimmer, nor the Quarterly Reviewers,* but I exposed them; nor Mr. Yorke, whom I called an outcast; not, as they say, because he had the doors of the House of Commons shut against strangers, but because the electors of Cambridgeshire rejected him.

There remains another charge of the Quarterly Reviewers, which I beg leave to submit to the judgment of the reader. They quote from *National Education*, "Universities are so universally esteemed illiberal in politics and religion, that

* This is the lurking cause of their strange perversion.

a few years ago an address from the University of Dublin, congratulating the King on his aversion to the Catholics, appeared in the Gazette. The editor had heard that such an address was to be offered to a board of its fellows for their approbation; and he concluded, of course, it would be adopted by them. To their honour, however, it was rejected, and thence the editor of the Gazette was obliged in a subsequent impression to retract the whole address under an erratum.

"After this argument, it is unnecessary," &c. As this was intended by the Quarterly Reviewers, to be a mortal wound, they did not trust to the power of italics only. They ushered the quotation with the following remark: "We before objected to a string of universal conclusions appended to a solitary fact. Our readers will perceive that here the case is somewhat altered; and they will doubtless rejoice in seeing the boundaries of logical deduction enlarged. A universal proposition is proved not by a solitary but by a contrary fact." By this quotation, and their italics, and their commentary, they would persuade the reader that the words "after this argument" refer solely to a portion of the preceding paragraph, though these words form a part of the conclusion of a chapter, entitled, *Concerning the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin*, and which consists of fifty-one pages.

I have now ended my defence, and proceed to my confession. I admit that Euripus, at page 24, is an error. But the Quarterly Reviewers have not marked its extent. Euripus should be Eurotas. The extent then of this error is, that the transcriber or printer erred by three letters; or to vary the expression, that one word was substituted for another, both which words had four let-

ters identical, and three similar, and that this error escaped correction. I have another confession to make; and first, I quote the words of the Reviewers. "Mr. Ensor would really confer a favour on the learned world, if he would but publish those fragments of Harmodius and Aristogiton, which have hitherto met the eye of no scholar but himself. If he would," &c. Now, gentle reader, what is the amount of this exultation of these combined critics against a single author? "fragments of" &c. should be printed "fragments on" &c.

Before I part with the Quarterly Reviewers, I beg leave to refresh their recollection by referring them to what I mentioned in the beginning of this Answer,—that they should be merciful to others from a consciousness of their own literary mistakes; and I quoted instances of these misfortunes. I beg leave also to hope, should they assail this Answer, that they will be merciful; and to direct their virtues on this and on other occasions, I take this opportunity to stimulate their weak recollection by observing, that they can not only commit errors, but make correction the means of accumulating errors. For this purpose, I quote a note in the *British Review*, No. I. p. 66—"See *Quarterly Review*, No. VII. p. 42, where a strange mistake is made in supposing that Mr. Addington, was minister in June, 1800. We beg pardon for noticing this mistake so pointedly, which we certainly should not have done, were it not that we were a little shocked at the use that is attempted to be made of it. It must however be observed, that the mistake is briefly noticed in the following Number, under the head *Errata*, where it is stated, that the word (*after*) was intended to be written (*before*), as it stands in the first line of this ar-

title. The Review, therefore, had it in contemplation to charge Mr. Pitt and Lord Spencer with all the blame and the *good-nature* imputed to the act in question." Here then *les aveugles clairvoyants* appear in a state of superlative reprobation,

"And hard be hardened, blind be *blinded*
more,
That they may stumble on, and deeper
fall."

Yet I do not say this is peculiar to them. There is a precedent for it. The great and good printer and publisher, George Faulkner, had some way confounded the works of Pope and Swift, *which* he thus corrected: "This fourth volume of Mr. Pope's works makes the fifth volume of Dean Swift's works."

I now now leave those gentlemen, the Quarterly Reviewers, to enjoy their *tears* among the *honeysuckles* and *gooseberry-bushes* of their own planting. One remark of theirs, however, remains unnoticed by me. They say, "Mr. Ensor's principal quarrel is with the doctrine of future torments." If it be any comfort to the Quarterly Reviewers to believe that they may be damned here and hereafter, I, of all men, am the last would deprive them of that consolation.

To the Proprietors of the Belfast Magazine.

IN the Selected Poetry for last month, I observed a short article extracted from the Morning Chronicle, addressed to the Princess Charlotte of Wales. I suppose the smoothness of the versification induced the selection, for the sentiment expressed in the last line is so contrary to the firm tone that you generally assume in your politics, that I cannot consider that its merit procured the insertion in your columns.

To talk of *her people*, gives a degrading image of servility: as if the many were made for the few, and as if kings ought to be considered in any other light, than as the first magistrates of a free people. These expressions, denoting a state so resembling personal servitude, reminds of the word homage: in base Latin homagium, "homo sum—I am your man: your slave," and is a word not fit to be found in the vocabulary of freemen, who understand their rights. The old phrases in law, "the King's court;" "contrary to his peace, his crown, and dignity," "the King's customs, duties, and excise," are all expressions calculated to mislead, and show the state of vassalage of former times. In a more enlightened period they ought to be changed to a style more appropriately fitted to convey just ideas of Kings being not despots, but merely the depositaries of power, for the general good of the community. From considerations of this kind may we not gather, notwithstanding Sir Francis Burdett's frequent appeals to the times of the early Edwards' and Henry's, or even to Saxon usages, that the true principles of liberty were not understood in those days? To establish liberty on a proper basis, let us not look back, but accept the aid modern philosophy affords to fix more correct principles, and a correspondent reformed nomenclature.

K

For the Belfast Monthly Magazine.

RAMBLE IN 1810.

(Concluded from No. 46, page 371.)

CONNOR early became of some note from one of the earliest Christian churches of this part of Ireland, being founded here about